

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by applicant's admitted prior art:

5

Claim 1:

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Specifically, the limitation
“forming a composite dielectric layer covering the select gate structures subsequent to
10 forming the doped region in the substrate between any two adjacent select gate
structures” has been added to claim 1. This limitation finds support in the specification in
[0020]-[0022] and in Figs. 8-9, for instance, and no new matter is introduced.

The method of claim 1 forms the doped region in the substrate first, and
15 subsequently forms the composite dielectric layer covering the select gate structure. As
for the AAPA, the composite dielectric layer covering the select gate structure is formed
prior to forming the doped region as shown in Figs. 4-5. Claim 1 now includes the step
sequence limitation that can definitely distinguish from AAPA, and therefore claim 1
should be patentable. Reconsideration of claim 1 is politely requested.

20

Claims 2-6:

Claims 2-6 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found
allowable. Reconsideration of claims 2-6 is therefore requested.

25

Claim 7:

Claim 7 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Specifically, the limitation “forming a composite dielectric layer covering the select gate structures subsequent to forming the doped region in the substrate between any two adjacent select gate structures” has been added to claim 7. This limitation finds support in the specification in
5 [0020]-[0022] and in Figs. 8-9, for instance, and no new matter is introduced.

The method of claim 7 forms the doped region in the substrate first, and subsequently forms the composite dielectric layer covering the select gate structure. As for the AAPA, the composite dielectric layer covering the select gate structure is formed
10 prior to forming the doped region as shown in Figs. 4-5. Claim 7 now includes the step sequence limitation that can definitely distinguish from AAPA, and therefore claim 7 should be patentable. Reconsideration of claim 7 is politely requested.

Claims 8-16:

15

Claims 8-16 are dependent on claim 7, and should be allowed if claim 7 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 8-16 is therefore requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this
20 case.

Appl. No. 10/711,258
Amdt. dated December 21, 2006
Reply to Office action of September 25, 2006

Sincerely yours,



Date: 12/21/2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)